



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,354	03/07/2002	Byung-jun Kim	1293.1342	7733
49455 7590 04/10/2008 STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP 1400 EYE STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER TOLENTINO, RODERICK				
ART UNIT 2134		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/10/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/092,354

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Roderick Tolentino

Art Unit

2134

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/14/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-949)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 27 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 03/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. The arguments filed After Final on 03/14/2008 have been considered and discussed with my SPE Kambiz Zand. In response to the arguments, Examiner is taking the time to clarify and modify the motivation of Katz and Kanota. Kanota teaches the superimposing of new copyright information. Katz teaches data with copyright information that includes the owner information. Kanota was brought into the rejection to show how new copyright information can be added to data. The combination of Katz's type of copyright information and Kanota's addition of new copyright information, teach the claim language of in claim 1, where "the processor to identify at least a maker of the remake content representing a user that is different from the copyright owner of original content," and similar language in the other independent claims. One of ordinary skill in the art would see that Kanota's addition of new copyright information, would include such information taught by Katz's copyright information, in particular the copyright identification data of the owner of the copyright or in Kanota's case the data of the owner superimposing new copyright information to the data. Thus teaching the part of the claim where there is an identification of an owner different from the original owner.

Art Unit: 2134

4. After closer review of the claims, if the content of claims 2 and 7 are included in claim 1 and in the other independent claims, Examiner would reconsider the allowability if the search of this language does not yield any new references. In the case where Applicant chooses to amend the claims, the amendment would be entered After Final. If willing to amend the claims as stated above, Applicant could contact the Examiner to discuss, amendments in more detail.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 11 – 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz et al. U.S. Patent No. (5,926,624) in view of Kanota et al. U.S. Patent No. (5,991,500).

7. As per claims 1, 8 and 15, Katz teaches at least one original content, a remake content made based on at least one original content (Katz, Col. 6 Lines 47 – 50, selected preview clips) and copyright information corresponding to the remake content, wherein the copyright information includes original copyright information which, when processed by a processor, is used to identify at least a copyright owner of the original content and remake copyright information which (Katz, Col. 7 Lines 10 – 16), but fails to teach when processed by the processor, causes the processor to identify at least a

maker of the remake content representing a user that is different from the copyright owner of original content. However, in an analogous art Kanota et al. teaches when processed by the processor, causes the processor to identify at least a maker of the remake content representing a user that is different from the copyright owner of original content (Kanota, Col. 2 Lines 28 – 45).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Kanota's copy control for video signal with copyright signals with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of inhibiting the making of unauthorized copies (Kanota, Col. 1 Lines 54 – 60), it would further be obvious because Katz discloses copyright information which has information identifying the owner which equates to "used to identify at least a copyright owner of the original content and remake copyright information which" and the superimposing of copyright data taught by Kanota, can be seen by one of ordinary skill in the art to include all copyright information taught by Katz including the owner data, in this case the party superimposing the new copyright information to the data. Which equates to "processed by the processor, causes the processor to identify at least a maker of the remake content representing a user that is different from the copyright owner of original content," and thus would be obvious to combine the two references.

8. As per claim 6, Katz teaches the remake content is recorded in at least one audio packet containing audio data and the original copyright information and the remake copyright information are recorded in a private header containing header information on the remake content (Katz, Col. 6 Line 55 – 61, Col. 9 Lines 1 - 6).

9. As per claim 9, Katz teaches the making of a remake content, the remake content is made by sampling the original content (Katz, Fig. 3 Items 307, 310 and 323, Raw Data and Preview Generator).
10. As per claim 10, Katz teaches the making of a remake content, the remake content is made by a different coding method from a coding method by which the original content is made (Katz, Fig. 3 Item 318, Col. 7 Lines 49 – 50, scrambler, Col. 5 Lines 60 – 64, Raw Data no coding).
11. As per claim 11 Katz teaches during the making of a remake content, the remake content is made by reading the original content from another recording medium and recording the original content in the recording medium different from the another recording medium (Katz, Fig. 3 Item 307, Raw data and Fig. 323, Preview Generator).
12. As per claim 12, Katz teaches the original content includes audio data or video data (Katz, Col. 5 Lines 46 – 65).
13. As per claim 13, Katz teaches the recording of the remake content, the remake content is recorded as at least one audio packet containing the remake content, and during the recording of original copyright information to identify at least a copyright owner of the original content and remake copyright information to identify at least a maker of the remake content, original copyright information and remake copyright information are recorded in a private header for at least one audio packet in which the remake content is recorded (Katz, Col. 6 Line 55 – 61, Col. 9 Lines 1 - 6).
14. As per claim 16, Katz teaches a decoder to decode the original content (Katz, Col. 6 Line 67 and Col. 7 Lines 1 – 3, descrambler) and an encoder to encode the

original content decoded by the decoder into a remake content (Katz, Fig. 3 Item 318, Col. 7 Lines 49 – 50).

15. Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz et al. U.S. Patent No. (5,926,624) and Kanota et al. U.S. Patent No. (5,991,500) and in view of Fuchigami et al U.S. Patent No. (5,960,398).

16. As per claims 2, 14 and 19 Katz teaches copyright information that includes an identification code of the apparatus used to identify the maker of the remake content (Katz, Col. 6 Lines 55 – 61, medium from which digital information originated), but fails to teach copyright information that includes a producer code of an apparatus used in making the remake content. However, Fuchigami teaches copyright information that includes a producer code of an apparatus used in making the remake content (Fuchigami, Col. 5 Lines 46 – 56, SID).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Fuchigami's copyright embedding apparatus with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of managing copyrights in a storage medium (Fuchigami, Col.1 Lines 5 – 11).

17. As per claim 3, Katz as modified teaches the remake copyright information further includes encoding information by which a reproducing apparatus can determine whether reproducing the remake content is possible (Katz, Col. 6 Line 67 and Col. 7 Lines 1 – 3, descrambling map, and Col. 6 Lines 55 – 61, copyright).

18. As per claim 4, Katz as modified teaches the remake copyright information further includes the version of the remake copyright information (Katz, Col. 6 Lines 54 64, Volume).

19. As per claim 5, Katz as modified teaches copyright information that includes the amount of allowable copies are to be made (Fuchigami, et al., Col 5 Line 54, allowable copies).

20. As per claim 7, Katz as modified teaches the original copyright information includes a country code, an owner code, a year of recording and a serial number (Fuchigami, Col. 5 Lines 46 – 56, ISRC).

21. As per claim 20, Katz as modified teaches the remake copyright information further includes information on the number of times that the remakes on the original is permitted (Fuchigami, et al., Col 5 Line 54, allowable copies).

22. As per claim 21, Katz teaches the original content includes audio data or video data (Katz, Col. 5 Lines 46 – 65), but fails to teach the original copyright information is an International Standard Recording Code (ISRC). However, Fuchigami teaches the original copyright information is an International Standard Recording Code (ISRC) (Fuchigami, Col. 5 Lines 46 – 56).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Fuchigami's copyright embedding apparatus with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of managing copyrights in a storage medium (Fuchigami, Col.1 Lines 5 – 11).

23. As per claim 22, Katz fails to disclose the recording includes decrementing the number of remakes and recording the decremented number as copyright remake content. However Fuchigami discloses the recording includes decrementing the number of remakes and recording the decremented number as copyright remake content (Fuchigami, Col. 5 Line 52-54, allowable copies).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Fuchigami's copyright embedding apparatus with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of managing copyrights in a storage medium (Fuchigami, Col.1 Lines 5 – 11).

24. Claims 17, 18, 24, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz et al. U.S. Patent No. (5,926,624) and Kanota et al. U.S. Patent No. (5,991,500) and in view of Bersson U.S. Patent No. (6,081,897).

25. As per claim 17, Katz fails to teach a reading unit to read the original content and the original copyright information from the recording method, wherein the processor generates identification information of the original content by receiving the original copyright information from the reading unit and outputting the original copyright information. However, Bersson teaches a reading unit to read the original content and the original copyright information from the recording method, wherein the processor generates identification information of the original content by receiving the original copyright information from the reading unit and outputting the original copyright information (Bersson, Col. 2 Lines 51 – 65).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Bersson's apparatus for preventing unauthorized copying of digital data with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of controlling the unauthorized copying of copyrighted work (Bersson, Col. 1 Lines 42 – 44).

26. As per claim 18, Katz as modified teaches the recording unit records the original copyright information and the remake copyright information in a header in which header information on the remake content is recorded (Katz, Col. 6 Lines 54 – 61).

27. As per claim 24, Katz teaches original copyright information to identify at least as copyright owner of the original content and remake copyright information to identify at least a maker of the remake content (Katz, Col. 6 Lines 55 – 61), and a reproducing unit to receive and reproduce the remake content read from said reading unit (Katz, Fig. 3 Item 323), but fails to teach representing a user that is different from the copyright owner of the original content and a reading unit to read copyright information on a remake content from said recording medium and a processor to determine whether the remake content of the recording medium is reproducible based on the copyright information read from said reading unit and the remake content is reproducible, to issue a command to said reading unit to read the remake content. However, Kanota teaches representing a user that is different from the copyright owner of the original content (Kanota, Col. 2 Lines 28 – 45) and Bersson teaches a reading unit to read copyright information on a remake content from said recording medium and a processor to determine whether the remake content of the recording medium is reproducible based

Art Unit: 2134

on the copyright information read from said reading unit and the remake content is reproducible, to issue a command to said reading unit to read the remake content (Bersson, Col. 2 Lines 51 – 65).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Kanota's copy control for video signal with copyright signals with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of inhibiting the making of unauthorized copies (Kanota, Col. 1 Lines 54 – 60).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Bersson's apparatus for preventing unauthorized copying of digital data with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of controlling the unauthorized copying of copyrighted work (Bersson, Col. 1 Lines 42 – 44).

28. As per claim 25, Katz as modified teaches the reproducing unit further comprises a decoding unit to decode the remake content received (Katz, Col. 6 Line 67 and Col. 7 Lines 1 – 3, descrambler)

29. As per claim 27, Katz teaches original copyright information to identify at least as copyright owner of the original content and remake copyright information to identify at least a maker of the remake content (Katz, Col. 6 Lines 55 – 61) and reproducing the remake content (Katz, Fig. 3 Item 323), but fails to teach representing a user that is different from the copyright owner of the original content and reading copyright information from a recording medium, determining whether a remake content is reproducible from the recording medium based on the copyright information and reading

Art Unit: 2134

the remake content from the recording medium based on the copyright information. However, Kanota teaches representing a user that is different from the copyright owner of the original content (Kanota, Col. 2 Lines 28 – 45) and Bersson teaches reading copyright information from a recording medium, determining whether remake content is reproducible from the recording medium based on the copyright information and reading the remake content from the recording medium based on the copyright information (Bersson, Col. 2 Lines 51 – 65).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Kanota's copy control for video signal with copyright signals with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of inhibiting the making of unauthorized copies (Kanota, Col. 1 Lines 54 – 60).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Bersson's apparatus for preventing unauthorized copying of digital data with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of controlling the unauthorized copying of copyrighted work (Bersson, Col. 1 Lines 42 – 44).

30. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz et al. U.S. Patent No. (5,926,624), Kanota et al. U.S. Patent No. (5,991,500) and Bersson U.S. Patent No. (6,081,897), as applied to claims 17, 18, 24 and 27, an in further view of Fuchigami et al U.S. Patent No. (5,960,398).

31. As per claim 23, Katz as modified fails to teach the recording unit decrements the number of remakes and records the decremented number as copyright remake content. However, Fuchigami teaches the recording unit decrements the number of remakes and records the decremented number as copyright remake content (Fuchigami, et al., Col 5 Line 54, allowable copies).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Fuchigami's copyright embedding apparatus with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of managing copyrights in a storage medium (Fuchigami, Col.1 Lines 5 – 11).

32. As per claim 26, Katz teaches the remake copyright information on the remake content, an identification code of the apparatus used in making the remake content (Katz, Col. 6 Lines 55 – 61, original medium information), encoding information of the remake content (Katz, Col. 6 Line 67 and Col. 7 Lines 1 – 3, descrambler) and the version of the remake copyright information (Katz, Col. 6 Lines 55 – 61, volume), but fails to teach a producer code of an apparatus used in making the remake content. However, Fuchigami teaches a producer code of an apparatus used in making the remake content (Fuchigami, Col. 5 Lines 46 – 56, SID).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Fuchigami's copyright embedding apparatus with Katz's Digital information delivery service because it offers the advantage of managing copyrights in a storage medium (Fuchigami, Col.1 Lines 5 – 11).

Conclusion

33. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Iat whose telephone number is (571) 272-2661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Roderick Tolentino
Examiner
Art Unit 2134

Roderick Tolentino

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2134